

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-11 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment Applicant is amending claims 1, 5 and 8 and adding new claims 12-15. No new matter is added.

112 Rejections

Claim 5 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because the Examiner fails to understand the relationship between the first and second transponder.

The Examiner states it is unclear from the claim language that the transponders discussed in claim 5 are in fact the same ones previously recited. Applicant's clarifying amendment to claim 5 overcomes this rejection.

103 rejections

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takashima in view of Watanuki. The Examiner continues to allege that Takashima discloses the claimed invention, with the exception of the detachment of the transponder from the plate. *See* Office Action at page 3. The Examiner also continues to assert that one skilled in the art would have found it obvious to use different transponders in view of Watanuki. *See* Office Action at page 4.

The Examiner considered Applicant's last submission of June 29, 2006, including the declaration by Mr. Ichikawa, but remains unpersuaded for the reasons stated on pages 5-6 of the Office Action. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that an access door is provided by the disclosure of Watanuki, rendering the transponder removable from the plate and that the

Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 6/29/2006 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 7, 9 and 10 based upon Takashima and Watanuki because the Declaration sets forth the method of how the transponder can be removed from the key. *See* Office Action at page 5-6.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's basis for rejecting the claims for the reason Applicant has already made of record and also those discussed below.

The Applicant submits claim 1 recites that the transponder is structured to be detached *without damaging the lock plate or the transponder*. Indeed, even the Examiner acknowledges that the hooks of the cap in the structure of Watanuki might be damaged if the cap is forcibly opened. *See* Office Action at page 6, first paragraph.

Regarding claim 5, the Examiner continues to rely on Guba as allegedly teaching the provision of multiple transponders with different engine performances in rejecting claim 5. However, the Examiner offers no explanation for this argument. The Applicant respectfully notes that the entry system 12 is not disclosed as being exchangeable in Guba, a key feature of the transponder's detachability. The entry system will transmit a signal to the control module, however, there is no mention or suggestion of interchangeability of entry systems, the only element, if any, in Guba corresponding to a transponder.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO. 10/811,862

DOCKET NO. Q80693

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Raja S. Iyer #43,078
for

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Chid S. Iyer
Registration No. 43,355

Date: November 13, 2006